

Baku Climate Change Conference Wednesday, 13 November 2024

Finance negotiators once again met for back-to-back sessions throughout the day, including to consider progress in the operationalization of the new Loss and Damage Fund. Heads of State and Government continued providing statements in the high-level segment and the plenary resumed for opening statements.

Resumed Opening Plenary

The G-77/CHINA underscored that all implementation requires access to means of implementation, highlighting its calls for a balanced new collective quantified goal on climate finance (NCQG) that is responsive to developing countries' needs and for a technology implementation programme supported by the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism.

The EU called for the conference to show countries' collective response to climate change through implementing the Global Stocktake (GST) in its entirety, progressing on mitigation and adaptation, and adopting an NCQG with a broadened contributor base that supports the most vulnerable.

The ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY GROUP (EIG) observed that one year after agreeing to transition away from fossil fuels, fossil fuel subsidies are ten times the magnitude of climate finance. They called for an NCQG that is fit for the scale of countries' needs and the transformation ahead, and which "pushes and pulls" capital to where it is most needed.

The UMBRELLA GROUP called for "unequivocal resolve" to follow-up on the GST outcome. They said the NCQG should be multilayered, with a core of billions in support provided and mobilized, complemented by trillions in investment, and called on those with capacity to step up.

BRAZIL, SOUTH AFRICA, INDIA, and CHINA underlined that it is time to fully and effectively implement the Convention and its Paris Agreement, and rejected attempts by developed countries to weaken their responsibility to provide finance.

The ARAB GROUP highlighted the key role of the NCQG for implementing the GST outcomes and ensuring just transition. He stressed the importance of dealing with the negative impacts of response measures and called for operationalization of Article 6 in a balanced and efficient manner.

The AFRICAN GROUP underscored public finance as the core of the NCQG, expressing concern over attempts to renegotiate the contributor and recipient base. He lamented the prohibitive cost of capital and emphasized ensuring debt sustainability.

The Like-Minded Group of Developing Countries (LMDCs) said public finance is key to the NCQG and objected to the notion

of a layered goal. He called on developed countries to fulfill their obligations and ensure increased finance, including for adaptation, loss and damage, and the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN).

The LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (LDCs) called for enhancing the capitalization of the Loss and Damage Fund and for the NCQG to meet LDCs' needs with respect to mitigation, adaptation, and loss and damage, with finance being predominantly grant-based. He called for a clear definition of what counts as climate finance.

GRUPO SUR emphasized that developing countries' ambition is contingent upon developed countries' provision of financial, technical, and capacity-building support, not the other way around, and objected to discussions on donor base expansion.

The MOUNTAIN PARTNERSHIP emphasized threats related to melting mountain glaciers, both locally and with respect to sea-level rise, and welcomed the convening of Presidency consultations on mountains to foster progress on the matter.

The INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE (IPCC) emphasized the importance of systematic observation to understand climate change trends. He highlighted that the IPCC is striving to engage more women and early career scientists in its seventh assessment process and recognized the need to include diverse perspectives, such as those of Indigenous Peoples. GLOBAL CLIMATE OBSERVING SYSTEM (GCOS) stressed maintaining in-situ observation stations and data archives, and called on parties to continue observations on glaciers, ensure historic data availability, and appoint national GCOS coordinators. The WORLD METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION (WMO) highlighted the role of the Global Greenhouse Gas Watch initiative in providing data to inform decision making and called for increased funding to the Systematic Observations Financing Facility. WORLD CLIMATE RESEARCH PROGRAMME outlined its many projects, including upcoming work to fill knowledge gaps in global precipitation, with a focus on freshwater regions.

The INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION (ICAO) reported on the deployment of sustainable aviation fuels, called for Article 6 operationalization, and warned that taxation on aviation would affect connectivity in developing countries.

CLIMATE ACTION NETWORK underlined that countries seem intent on "pouring fuel on the fire" and stressed that the commitments from Dubai mean nothing if countries do not put their money where their mouth is. DEMAND CLIMATE JUSTICE decried carbon markets as illegitimate, and denounced

prioritization of funding for the arms industry at the expense of lives and emissions reductions.

FARMERS situated themselves on the frontlines, urged parties for recognition in discussions on agriculture, nationally determined contributions (NDCs), the NCQG, and Loss and Damage Fund, and stressed that carbon markets must protect farmers' rights. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES lamented that states have failed to act while imposing false solutions such as Article 6 and geoengineering, equating these actions to genocide and ecocide. They stressed the need to stop conflating Indigenous Peoples with local communities.

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND MUNICIPAL AUTHORITIES called on parties to set and achieve more ambitious NDCs in partnership with the "indispensable" subnational governments. RESEARCH AND INDEPENDENT NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (NGOs) outlined documented rises in fossil fuel use. They urged parties to center science for a transformational trajectory that ensures the security and resilience of all people and nature.

WOMEN AND GENDER lamented the lack of political will from parties, particularly on the Lima work programme on gender, which has failed to realize gender-just climate action. They challenged the "myth of financial scarcity," given that carbon markets and climate inaction enrich the few at the expense of the Global South. CHILDREN AND YOUTH explained how developed countries' failure to provide their fair share of finance violates the rights of future generations. They expressed outrage at their marginalization at the expense of Presidency-chosen Youth Climate Champions and COPs that continue to propagate fossil fuel exploitation.

TRADE UNION NGOs relayed how 2.4 million workers, from factories to fields, are at risk from climate-related hazards. They underscored how grant-based finance can realize systematic change that protects human rights and workers' rights, and a just transition that is the hope for survival. BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY NGOs viewed finalizing Article 6 as crucial to this COP's success and viewed the decision already taken as a step in the right direction, citing additional work required on the NCQG to provide the signals to business and investment sectors.

Finance

NCQG: These informal consultations under the Conference of the Parties (COP) serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA) were co-facilitated by Fiona Gilbert (Australia). Parties welcomed the new draft text as a basis for discussions and requested the Co-Facilitators to streamline the document to remove duplication, while not deleting any ideas. The EIG and EU suggested informal discussions on access, transparency, and rights-based language. The ARAB GROUP rejected producing text through informal-informal consultations.

Matters relating to the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF): In the joint COP/CMA contact group, co-chaired by Clara Schultz (Sweden) and Ali Waqas (Pakistan), parties continued their initial exchange on expectations for a decision.

On the Biennial Assessment, the US and NEW ZEALAND called for highlighting key recommendations, particularly on Paris Agreement Article 2.1c (finance flow alignment), which the AFRICAN GROUP suggested is a duplication of work, given ongoing discussions under the Dialogue on the scope of Article 2.1c. The LDCs suggested including loss and damage in the next Assessment.

On a common climate finance definition, the LDCs and AFRICAN GROUP called for further work, noting the SCF did not provide recommendations. The US, CANADA, and NEW ZEALAND preferred no further work given the SCF's workload, observing that the Committee could not complete its work on guidance to the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and Global Environment Facility (GEF). The Co-Chairs will produce draft decision texts.

Report of, and guidance to, the Green Climate Fund: In a COP contact group, co-chaired by Pierre Marc (France), parties called for streamlining the [elements](#) for a draft decision compiled by the SCF. The AFRICAN GROUP emphasized welcoming the GCF's success in leveraging private sector resources and encouraging developed country contributors to enable the Fund to manage USD 50 billion by 2030. The US and CANADA noted the guidance should be directed to the GCF, not parties. The EU supported the proposal to move from annual to biennial guidance to the GCF.

Other comments related to, among others: enhanced coherence and complementarity with other funds; prioritizing high-impact proposals; expediting readiness support; ensuring monitoring of multi-country projects on a per-country basis; expeditiously accrediting and prioritizing direct access entities; lack of geographical diversity among GCF staff; and establishing a regional GCF presence in Latin America and the Caribbean. The Co-Chairs welcomed written submissions and will prepare a streamlined draft text.

In the CMA contact group, the ARAB GROUP emphasized welcoming the outcome on the NCQG and calling on developed countries to expeditiously increase their contributions in line with the agreed quantum, and objected to language on finance flow consistency. The Co-Chairs welcomed written submissions and will prepare a streamlined draft text.

Report of, and guidance to, the Global Environment Facility: In a COP contact group, co-chaired by David Kaluba (Zambia), parties called for streamlining the SCF's elements for draft guidance. The INDEPENDENT ALLIANCE OF LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN (AILAC) underscored the need to provide guidance on the next replenishment, with the ARAB GROUP emphasizing it should be commensurate to developing countries' needs and EGYPT calling for at least a doubling compared to the eighth replenishment. The ARAB GROUP noted the need for continued support for reporting under the Convention. The EU supported a proposal to move from annual to biennial guidance to the GEF.

Other comments related to enhancing, among others: support and accessibility of support for LDCs and small island developing states (SIDS); linkages between the Financial Mechanism and the Technology Mechanism; gender responsiveness; and coherence with other funds, including with respect to accreditation processes. The Co-Chairs welcomed written submissions and will prepare a streamlined draft text.

Report of, and guidance to, the Loss and Damage Fund: In the COP contact group, Co-Chair Amena Yauvoli (Fiji), invited comments on elements for a draft decision on the report ([CP/2024/9-CMA/2024/13](#), and [Adds.1](#)). Parties were positive about the Board's work, including finalizing arrangements with the World Bank and selecting the Philippines as the host country.

The EIG, the US, the EU, the UK, NEW ZEALAND, CANADA, NORWAY, and AUSTRALIA preferred a procedural draft decision welcoming the Board's report and work, without specifying further guidance.

Many developing countries identified substantive elements for the decision, particularly on the long-term resource mobilization strategy. The AFRICAN GROUP stressed the Fund should respond to developing countries' needs, and AILAC underscored that all developing countries should be eligible to access the Fund. The ARAB GROUP suggested urging developed countries to provide support. AILAC, INDIA, and EGYPT stressed the need to turn pledges into contribution agreements, with the ALLIANCE OF SMALL ISLAND STATES (AOSIS) noting that current pledges are insufficient. The Co-Chairs will prepare a draft decision to adopt the arrangements under the COP and, given no additional comments were provided, under the CMA.

Arrangements between the COP, CMA, and the Board of the Loss and Damage Fund: In the COP contact group, co-chaired by Jose Delgado (Austria), parties stated their willingness to approve the draft arrangements recommended by the SCF ([CP/2024/6/Add.8](#), [CMA/2024/8/Add.8](#)). AOSIS underlined its understanding that the Fund, as an operating entity of the Financial Mechanism, would be subject to periodic review of the Mechanism. The Co-Chairs will prepare a draft decision to adopt the arrangements under the COP and, given no additional comments were provided, under the CMA.

Matters relating to the Adaptation Fund (AF): In CMP and CMA contact groups, co-chaired by Ralph Bodle (Germany) and Isatou Camara (the Gambia), parties discussed elements of both the COP serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP) and CMA decisions. AILAC and the LDCs urged recognition of the need to scale up adaptation finance.

Views diverged on the AF Board's work to transition to the Fund exclusively serving the Paris Agreement. The EU, the EIG, the UK, the US, and CANADA foresaw that share of proceeds from the Article 6.4 Mechanism will soon be available and called for the Board to amend and adopt the relevant statutory documents.

The ARAB GROUP, LMDCs, and AFRICAN GROUP said this work cannot be finalized until the CMP and CMA confirm that share of proceeds are available, and called for clarity on how those would be made available.

The Board Secretariat reported that work related to the transition is ongoing, and the World Bank, as trustee, requested that the documents be confidential until they are finalized. The AFRICAN GROUP recalled its wider questions about the trustee arrangements.

Dialogue on the scope of Paris Agreement Article 2.1c and its complementarity with Article 9: In the CMA contact group, co-chaired by Elena Pereira Colindres (Honduras) and Ben Abraham (New Zealand), parties sought to identify elements for a draft decision.

GRUPO SUR, the LDCs, the AFRICAN GROUP, AILAC, the ARAB GROUP, the LMDCs, and the RUSSIAN FEDERATION observed views remain divergent on the interpretation of Article 2.1c, while the US, AUSTRALIA, and the UK thought a collective understanding was emerging. The ARAB GROUP, the LMDCs, and KENYA stressed adopting a procedural decision given the differing interpretations.

Several developing countries cited challenges referenced in the report, such as high costs of capital and debt levels, and limited fiscal space. AOSIS stressed that the workshops convened under the dialogue so far held little relevance to SIDS, particularly the presentations by external organizations.

On future topics for the dialogue, there was emerging consensus for additional adaptation discussions, although the

ARAB GROUP said the decision should not identify future topics. The EIG and EU supported work on tracking progress. The EU suggested discussing the role of the international financial system. CANADA called for further work on the challenges of LDCs and SIDS. AUSTRALIA suggested a focus on smaller economies. The Co-Chairs will prepare a draft decision.

Dialogue on implementing the GST outcomes, referred to in paragraph 97 of decision 1/CMA.5: In informal consultations under the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI), Co-Facilitator Ricardo Marshall (Barbados) noted divergent views on the scope, and suggested this session focus on modalities, taking as a basis the [informal note](#) from SB 60.

AILAC said the dialogue should facilitate discussions under each thematic area of the GST by addressing: collective progress in implementing the calls outlined in the GST decision; barriers and challenges hindering such progress, particularly in relation to means of implementation; and what additional commitments are necessary to close gaps. The LMDCs emphasized the dialogue should track progress in the delivery of the NCQG and inform its revision. The EU encouraged discussions on the modalities, suggesting the dialogue's scope be addressed at a higher level.

The Co-Facilitators will prepare an informal note.

Mitigation

Guidance on Cooperative Approaches referred to in Paris Agreement Article 6.2: In informal consultations spanning the entire morning, co-facilitated by Peer Stiansen (Norway) and Maria Al Jishi (Saudi Arabia), parties proposed ways to streamline the draft text from SBSTA 60.

On the process for identifying and addressing inconsistencies in reporting, including by the Article 6 technical expert reviews, countries debated at length the prescriptiveness of guidance on what constitutes a "significant" or "persistent" inconsistency. The UK proposed linking the definition of "significant" to double counting, while the EU saw the need for a broader, "graded" definition. Many favored giving the reviewers leeway to define these terms. AOSIS called for addressing inconsistencies in both quantitative and qualitative information. The LMDCs cautioned against introducing new terms, such as "material inconsistencies."

Various parties also stressed the need to detail a link to trigger liaison with the Paris Agreement Implementation and Compliance Committee in certain cases of inconsistencies identified by the reviewers. Many, including AILAC, GRUPO SUR, the EU, and the AFRICAN GROUP, supported text on halting the transfer of and use toward NDCs of internationally transferred mitigation outcomes (ITMOs) where inconsistencies are identified.

On additional functionalities and procedures for the international registry, parties noted that major differences in views remained, with many clarifying their positions or suggesting potential ways to bridge diverging views. The US opposed any functions beyond those of tracking and recording data on party actions relating to ITMOs, cautioning that expanding the functions would require an extensive work programme and could lead to parties having to reformulate national arrangements to align with those of the international registry. Noting the group is not calling for the registry to perform issuances, the AFRICAN GROUP stressed allowing countries that do not have registries to use the international registry for functions such as authorization, transfers, and use of credits. Similar views were shared by GRUPO SUR, AOSIS and the LDCs. NEW ZEALAND suggested differentiating between ITMOs, for which these functions could be enabled in the international registry, and mitigation outcomes, for which

only “pull and view” would be made available, noting that the international registry only serves ITMOs. Many stressed the need for capacity building support to enable parties to develop national registries.

Parties mandated the Co-Facilitators to develop a new iteration of text.

Rules, Modalities, and Procedures for the Mechanism established by Paris Agreement Article 6.4: During the CMA contact group, Co-Chairs Kate Hancock (Australia) and Sonam Tashi (Bhutan) invited parties to consider the Article 6.4 Supervisory Body’s annual report to the CMA ([FCCC/PA/CMA/2024/2](#) and [Add.1](#)) and propose elements of a draft CMA decision. The COALITION FOR RAINFOREST NATIONS (CfRN) condemned the “horrible precedent” set by the Supervisory Body’s adoption of the Article 6.4 methodologies and removals guidelines, rather than fulfilling its mandate to elaborate and recommend the guidelines for the CMA to adopt. ENVIRONMENTAL NGOs (ENGOs) and TRADE UNION NGOs lamented the Supervisory Body’s governance breach and called for guidance to ensure the integrity of the mechanism.

On elements for a draft CMA decision, the EU and AFRICAN GROUP recommended a mode of work where the Supervisory Body Chair gives an oral report to the CMA in addition to the written annual report. The LDCs supported exempting LDCs from payment of the share of proceeds for adaptation. GRUPO SUR supported addressing the transition of Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) afforestation and reforestation projects to the Article 6.4 mechanism. AILAC supported guidance relating to a post-crediting monitoring period and JAPAN called for work on baseline tools and implementation of the mechanism registry.

The Co-Chairs will prepare a draft text.

Work Programme under the Framework for Non-market Approaches (NMAs) referred to in Paris Agreement Article 6.8: During the SBI contact group, Co-Chairs Kristin Qui (Trinidad and Tobago) and Jacqui Ruesga (New Zealand) introduced new draft text, noting it includes an assessment of the work programme’s first phase, recommendations for phase two, and matters relating to the web-based platform and capacity building.

On phase one assessment, the LMDCs clarified their proposal to include a quantitative assessment of how NMAs have helped countries implement their NDCs. The CFRN and the LMDCs urged continued consideration of phase one topics even during phase two, saying these have not been properly addressed.

On phase two recommendations, most parties, including the ARAB GROUP, the EU, the US, TÜRKIYE, and others, opposed including additional focus areas. Several parties also questioned the listing of topics for spinoff groups, preferring for parties to continue identifying topics as and when necessary. The CfRN, EU, and others, opposed reference to “Mother Earth Centric Actions,” while the LMDCs underlined the need to promote joint mitigation and adaptation action.

On the web-based platform and capacity building, the CfRN suggested that the survey for national focal points to flag barriers to using the platform be extended to non-party stakeholders, such as service providers already registered on the platform.

The Co-Chairs will produce a new iteration of the draft text.

Further guidance on NDC features: During the CMA informal consultations co-facilitated by Sin Liang Cheah (Singapore) and Federica Fricano (Italy), parties expressed

their views about what further guidance, if any, is required on the features of NDCs. Several, including the LDCs and the REPUBLIC OF KOREA, called for clarifying what guidance on features of NDCs there currently is before determining if further guidance is required. The AFRICAN GROUP and NORWAY pointed at current guidance in Paris Agreement Article 4 (NDCs) and Decision 4/CMA.1 (further guidance in relation to the mitigation section of decision 1/CP.21), and said no further guidance is required.

The ARAB GROUP and the REPUBLIC OF KOREA stressed any further guidance cannot contradict the Paris Agreement. Parties stressed the nationally-determined nature of NDCs and INDIA opposed introduction of top-down elements “in the guise of features.”

Other parties supported further guidance, noting common features can be identified from parties’ experience with submitting and implementing NDCs. The EU, AOSIS, and the LDCs identified economy-wide targets. JAPAN and the US called for quantification by all parties, and, with the LDCs but opposed by INDIA, supported alignment with the 1.5°C goal. The LDCs called for closing the finance gap to implement NDCs and clarity of NDC timelines. The LMDCs noted most NDCs are conditional and identified this as a feature of NDCs.

The Co-Chairs will consult with the Presidency on the way forward.

Adaptation

Matters relating to the Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA): SB informal discussions were co-facilitated by Lamin Dibba (the Gambia). Parties debated how to follow up on paragraph 38 of decision 2/CMA.5, which calls for the SBs to initiate consideration of matters relating to the GGA with a view to recommending a decision to CMA 7. Disagreements emerged over: whether to enter into focused discussions on the matter at this session or later; inputs on the GGA to future GSTs; and when to commence review of the GGA Framework, especially with regard to the timing of GST 2. Parties welcomed the technical paper on transformational adaptation ([FCCC/TP/2024/8](#)) prepared by the Secretariat, with some lamenting its late publication. Debates further touched upon: the need for a standalone agenda item on the GGA beyond CMA 7; the role of Convention principles in guiding work on the GGA; and avoiding duplication and overlap with other processes.

The Co-Facilitators will produce a draft text.

Report of the Adaptation Committee: In SB informal consultation, co-facilitated by Lina Yassin (Sudan), the AFRICAN GROUP insisted on projecting on screen the recommendations to the COP and CMA contained in the Committee’s report ([FCCC/SB/2024/4](#)) to allow for textual negotiations. The EU, AUSTRALIA, the US, and CANADA objected, preferring to mandate the Co-Facilitators to prepare draft text first. The Co-Facilitators will consult the SB Chairs on how to move forward.

National Adaptation Plans: In SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Meredith Ryder-Rude (US) introduced a color-coded and annotated update to the [informal note](#) developed at SBI 60, prompting huddles for parties to coordinate. When consultations resumed, the G-77/CHINA stated it did not agree with some of the color codes and annotations, and requested for the informal note from SBI 60 to be projected on screen for parties to propose textual edits. The EU, NORWAY, and the US opposed this, warning that doing so would mean “taking a step back” and

preferred requesting the Co-Facilitators to streamline the informal note before considering textual edits.

The Co-Facilitators noted that the discussions had reached an impasse and urged parties to consult informally.

Loss and Damage

Joint annual report of the Executive Committee (ExCom) of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts (WIM) and the Santiago Network: In SB informal consultations, co-facilitated by Pasha Carruthers (Cook Islands) and Farhan Akhtar (US), parties called for a single decision to address both the joint report ([FCCC/SB/2024/2](#)) and the 2024 WIM review. The AFRICAN GROUP stressed that any decision should respect the distinction between, and independence of, the WIM ExCom and the Santiago Network.

Parties welcomed significant advances in operationalizing the Santiago Network. AILAC called for the swift establishment of regional offices, with the AFRICAN GROUP calling for at least two to be located in Africa. The LDCs emphasized the distinction between funding for the Santiago Network and pledges to the Loss and Damage Fund. AILAC and the AFRICAN GROUP urged delivery of outstanding pledges to the Network.

2024 Review of the WIM: In SB informal consultations, co-facilitated by Pasha Carruthers (Cook Islands), parties suggested text for inclusion in a draft decision. Opinions converged on the need to increase the accessibility of the WIM's knowledge products, including by translating them into all UN languages, and for coordination and coherence among the WIM, the Santiago Network, and the Loss and Damage Fund, as well as with the broader institutional landscape on loss and damage.

AOSIS and the AFRICAN GROUP called for the WIM to prepare regular reports on the global state of loss and damage, while AUSTRALIA and the UK requested further details on the specific rationale for, and potential content of, such a report.

AILAC and the LDCs underscored that the WIM has achieved little progress in relation to its third function: action and support. Delegates agreed that the role of the WIM's Expert Group on Action and Support, as well as that of the national loss and damage contact points, should be reviewed.

The Co-Facilitators will prepare an informal note synthesizing views expressed.

Other Issues

Linkages between the Technology Mechanism and the Financial Mechanism: During the SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Stephen Minas (Greece) noted SBI 60 agreed to continue consideration of this item at SBI 61, taking into account the draft text from SBI 60, and invited comments on elements for a draft COP decision.

Parties expressed diverging views on how to proceed, debating what "taking into account" means. The G-77/CHINA supported using the text to move forward with discussions. JAPAN preferred starting afresh. The UK and EU suggested, among others: welcoming the report on the in-session workshop held at SBI 60 ([FCCC/SBI/2024/16](#)) and to the synthesis report on maintaining and enhancing collaboration and cooperation between them ([FCCC/SBI/2024/1](#)); identifying examples of enhanced collaboration; and encouraging continued collaboration. The EU also proposed encouraging the CTCN to enhance strategic alignment with GCF and GEF programming.

Parties ultimately gave the Co-Facilitators the mandate to prepare draft text which incorporates both the SBI 60 draft text and views expressed during the session.

Poznan strategic programme on technology transfer: SBI informal consultations were co-facilitated by Duduzile Nhlegentwa-Masina (Eswatini) and Stig Svenningsen (Norway). Parties deliberated whether to conclude consideration of the matter at this COP, with many noting that no new projects were launched under the strategic programme since 2014 and the two last projects running are ending in 2024. They supported continuing technology discussions under the technology implementation programme established in the GST decision. The G-77/CHINA considered this premature, given the new programme has yet to be operationalized. The EU, UK, and US suggested the new programme will help to both identify and address technology needs. CANADA noted that the continuation or not of the strategic programme falls under the authority of the SCF. Informal consultations continued in the evening.

Research and Systematic Observation: In informal consultations under the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA), co-facilitated by Patricia Nyinguro (Kenya) and Frank McGovern (Ireland), parties welcomed the draft decision text. Debates centered on a reference to 2024 being the hottest year on record, which many considered "absolutely necessary." The LMDCs suggested the statement is misleading and that warming trends have to be viewed in light of cumulative historic emissions.

AOSIS welcomed the reference to delivering universal access to early warning systems, particularly for "vulnerable regions," suggesting to further specify it be prioritized for SIDS and LDCs. The LMDCs suggested delivering early warning systems, particularly to "developing countries," with a prioritization of vulnerable regions.

The Co-Facilitators will revise the draft decision text.

In the Corridors

A major debate in the corridors, on the floors, was the quality of the various coffee options. Like the negotiations at this stage, there was no resolution. The negotiations sure seem to add weight to the coffee debate. In multiple rooms, negotiators asked their Co-Facilitators to spend another sleepless night revising draft texts. The Co-Facilitators of discussions on the new finance goal waded through 65 pages of written inputs to produce the "monster" 34-page draft. Also in finance, the US twice requested for more time to provide their written inputs. "I'm glad someone asked," remarked a negotiator from the group of least developed countries.

Article 6.2 negotiators proved remarkably efficient. Perhaps they were inspired by the Article 6.4 decision on Monday, which one long-time negotiator called "reason to celebrate," but observers and the Coalition for Rainforest Nations condemned it in the resumed opening plenary. Elsewhere, one observer noted a "concerted, coordinated effort" to ensure that calls for finance to address technology needs "pop up" across agenda items. "It's key," she stressed, "as this could lead to some real improvements on the ground."

Messaging from a number of high-level dignitaries also made waves. "Azerbaijan picked a fight with France, Italy is dreaming of nuclear fusion, and Argentina commandeered its delegation back home" recounted a stunned delegate, "that's a bit too much drama for one day."

**Follow daily coverage and photos of the
UN Climate Change Conference Baku
UNFCCC COP 29**



enb.iisd.org



subscribe at bit.ly/enbupdate



[@IISD_ENB](https://twitter.com/IISD_ENB)



facebook.com/IISD.ENB

